



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,068	11/14/2003	Meng Yang	312762002710	2630
25225	7590	09/13/2007		
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 12531 HIGH BLUFF DRIVE SUITE 100 SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2040			EXAMINER QIAN, CELINE X	
			ART UNIT 1636	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/714,068	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YANG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Celine X. Qian Ph.D.	<b>Art Unit</b> 1636	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 31 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 37, 39 and 40.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☒ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Celine X Qian Ph.D.  
 Examiner  
 Art Unit: 1636

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the amendment does not overcome the 102 (b) rejection applied to claim 37, and the 1121st enablement rejection applied to claims 39 and 40 set forth of the record mailed on 6/25/07. The argument directed the 102 (b) rejection citing Hyatt v. Dudas is deemed unpersuasive because unlike the Hyatt v. Dudas, the teaching of Contag not only discloses the elements of the claimed invention, it does provide a connection between said elements. The abstract of Contag states "methods and compositions for detecting the localization light originating from a mammal are disclosed. Also disclosed are... animal models for disease states are disclosed, as are methods for localization and tracking progression of disease or a pathogen within the animal, and for screening putative therapeutic compounds effective to inhibit the disease or pathogen." Further, the specification of Contag states in col.4, that "in a related embodiment, the invention include a noninvasive method for detecting the localization of a promoter induction event in an animal made transgenic or chimeric for a construct including a gene encoding a light generating protein under the control of an inducible promoter...the animal is imaged as described above." lines 17-29. All other cited portion describing the light generating protein, and the type of promoter are connected by this relationship. Specifically, the teaching from col.9, line 31 directs to the light generating protein to be GFP, which is same as what's disclosed in the instant specification. Each element of the claimed invention is disclosed by Contag and inherency were not discussed in this rejection. For reasons set forth of the record and discussed above, this rejection is maintained.

Applicants argument regard the 112 1st paragraph has been considered but deemed unpersuasive. Contrary to Applicant's assertion, the rejection were not based on the breadth of the claim alone but rather a thorough analysis of the wands factor. Applicants alleges that the office offered no evidence that a change in the expression is not indicative of the gene was altered. In response, Applicants are reminded that a compound that inhibit the expression of the fluorophore, for example, via a mechanism of post transcriptional regulation, does not mean that the compound would affect the expression of the endogenous gene. The declaration of Dr. Hoffman will not be addressed because it is not submitted in a timely manner. As such, for reasons set forth in the previous office actions and above, this rejection is maintained.

CELINE QIAN, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

